## REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 are rejected. Claims 1, 4, 18, 24, and 27 are amended herein. Of the amended claims, Claims 18, 24, and 27 are amended only to correct typographical errors.

As an initial matter, Applicants cannot identify that drawings earlier submitted on February 7, 2002 have not been indicated as approved by the Examiner. Approval of the drawings is respectfully requested.

Before discussing the rejections set forth in the instant office action, Applicant would like to make of record a telephone interview, which took place on February 19, 2004 between the undersigned Attorney for the Applicants, Examiner Tram, and Supervisor Bella. The claimed symbol expansion display of the present invention was discussed in detail. Upon reaching a better understanding, the Supervisor expressed his opinion that certain wordings of Claim 1, in particular "related to" and "in combination with," are too vague. Applicant's Attorney agreed to consider amendment of Claim 1, but withheld any specific commitment to amend the claims in view of the fact that the phrase "related to" has been in the claim since they were originally filed and that the phrase "in combination with" was included in the claim in response to the last office action and that the claims have never been rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Nevertheless, in an effort to advance the prosecution, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to replace the language perceived by the Examiner as being vague. Applicant's Attorney would like to thank Examiner Tram and Supervisor Bella for the courtesy extended to the Applicant's Attorney during the telephone interview on February 19, 2004.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US patent number 5,553,209).

Applicants would like to remind the Examiner that to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. In this case, the Johnson reference fails to describe the claimed symbol expansion display (as recited in Claims 1 and 17), symbol expansion graphic (Claims 4 and 18), and symbol expansion data (Claims 7 and 27).

In accordance with the Supervisor's comments made during the above-mentioned February 19, 2004 telephone interview, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 herein to require "...a symbol expansion display having information associated with the one or more map display symbols on the computer map display, wherein the symbol expansion display is displayed concurrently with the one or more map display symbols." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 7, lines 11-26.

Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Johnson, since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...*a symbol expansion display* having information associated with the one or more map display symbols on the computer map display, wherein the symbol expansion display is *displayed concurrently* with the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 1.

With this particular arrangement, the present invention provides *a symbol expansion display* that can provide information associated with one or more map display symbols on a computer map display, concurrently with the one or more map display symbols. As the Examiner is aware, the Applicants are entitled to be their own lexicographer. In this case, Applicants submit that the *symbol expansion display* is clearly defined in the specification to have particular meaning. For example, as described on page 7, middle paragraph, and reproduced below, referring to FIG. 1A,

"...when a symbol or a group of symbols is selected using the pointed device 18, or other means for selecting, the symbol expansion system generates a *symbol expansion display*. [emphasis added] The symbol expansion display is a tabular list associated with the symbol, group of symbols, or underlying symbols. An exemplary symbol expansion display can include *symbol expansion graphics, and/or symbol expansion data*. [emphasis added] The tabular list can include only one symbol expansion graphic and one symbol expansion data. For example, when the normal map display symbol 22 is selected with the pointing device 18, the symbol expansion system 10 can provide a symbol expansion display 52 that includes a symbol expansion graphic 54 that corresponds to the record graphic 40 that further corresponds to the normal map display symbol 22. The symbol expansion system 10 can also provide a symbol expansion display 52 that includes symbol expansion text or data 56 that corresponds to the record data 42 that further corresponds to data associated with map display symbol 22. For example, the symbol expansion data 56 can indicate the number of troops associated with the map display symbol 22. Additionally, a lead line 58 can be displayed to guide a person viewing the map to visually associate the symbol expansion display 52 with the map display symbol 22."

The above-mentioned *symbol expansion graphics* and *symbol expansion data* are also given particular meaning throughout the specification. For example, at page 6, lines 10-11 it is described that the symbol expansion graphic (e.g., 54, FIG. 1) "...can have a different appearance that that of the map symbol display 22, including but not limited to, a different size, shape, and color." As another example, FIG. 2 clearly shows an exemplary symbol expansion display 106, having the symbol expansion graphics 108a, 110a, 112a, 114a in combination with symbol expansion data 108b, 110b, 112b, 114b.

In contrast, Johnson et al. merely provide the map display symbols, which can be normal, cluttered, or de-cluttered map display symbols, for example, as shown in FIGS 5a-5d of Johnson et al. Johnson generally provides symbol *contraction*, i.e., de-cluttered symbols as in FIG. 5a,

resulting in fewer symbols on a display. Johnson does not contemplate the claimed *symbol expansion display* having the *symbol expansion graphic* and/or the *symbol expansion data*.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Johnson et al.

Claims 1-16 and 22-24 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 1-16, and 22-24 are patentably distinct over the cited reference generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 4 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...presenting at least one of one or more *symbol expansion graphics* and one or more *symbol expansion data* associated with the selected record components in *the symbol expansion display* concurrently with the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 4. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion display, symbol expansion graphics, and symbol expansion data at column 3, lines 5-20. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion display, symbol expansion graphics, or symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 7 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...*filtering the record data* of the one or more map symbol records to provide the one or more *symbol expansion data* corresponding to a selected record data type," as set forth in Claim 7. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed filtering at column 3, lines 25-35. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of filtering as claimed and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 8 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... selecting a record data type selected from the group consisting of *a dollar asset range record data type, a friendliness range record data type,*

*a personnel size record data type, a security classification record data type, a type of service record data type, and an age of symbol record data type*," as set forth in Claim 8. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed characteristics at column 8, lines 60-67. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the above claimed characteristics and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 9 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... *filtering the record data* of the one or more map symbol records to provide *symbol expansion data* corresponding to a selected record data range," as set forth in Claim 9. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed filtering at column 3, lines 25-35. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed filtering and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 10 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... *algorithmically combining* map symbol records to provide the one or more *symbol expansion data*," as set forth in Claim 10. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed algorithmically combining at column 3, lines 25-35. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the above claimed algorithmically combining and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 11 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... providing the one or more *symbol expansion graphics*... ," as set forth in Claim 11. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion graphics at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion graphics and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 12 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing the one or more *symbol expansion data*... ," as set forth in Claim 12. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed

symbol expansion data at column 2, lines 60-67. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 13 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...providing *a user selectable language* for the list of *symbol expansion data*," as set forth in Claim 13. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed selectable language at column 8, lines 60-67. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed selectable language and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 14 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... providing *a lead line* from the map portion to the *symbol expansion display* where the lead line moves in accordance with the position of the symbol expansion display," as set forth in Claim 14. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed lead line and symbol expansion display at column 3, lines 5-13. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed lead line or symbol expansion display and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 15 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... *color coding* one or more of the one or more *symbol expansion graphics*... ," as set forth in Claim 15. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the color coding at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed color coding and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 16 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... augmenting the *symbol expansion display* with *special identifying characters* that indicate when information has been omitted from the *symbol expansion display*," as set forth in Claim 16. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion display and special identifying characters at column 7, lines 60-67. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion display or special identifying characters and respectfully request clarification.

For substantially the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 17 is patentably distinct over Johnson, since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... *a symbol expansion display* related to the map display region on the computer map display, wherein the symbol expansion display is *displayed in combination with* the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 17.

Claims 18-21 and 25-27 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 17. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 18-21 and 25-27 are patentably distinct over the cited reference generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 17.

Applicants submit that Claim 18 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... a display processor which receives and formats each of the one or more selected record components for presenting at least one of one or more *symbol expansion graphics* and one or more *symbol expansion data* in the *symbol expansion display* in combination with the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 18. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion display, symbol expansion graphics, and symbol expansion data at column 7, lines 39-58. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion display, symbol expansion graphics, or symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 19 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...means for providing the one or more *symbol expansion graphics*... ," as set forth in Claim 19. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion graphics at column 1, lines 15-22. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion graphics and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 20 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... means for providing the one or more

*symbol expansion data*... ," as set forth in Claim 20. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion data at column 2, lines 60-67. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 22 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... the computer map display is displayed at a first scale and the *symbol expansion display* is *displayed in combination with* the computer map display at the first scale," as set forth in Claim 22. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion display at column 5, lines 20-27. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion display and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 23 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... each of the one or more *symbol expansion graphics* is associated with a lower level of hierarchy of one of the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 23. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion graphics at column 5, lines 41-51. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion graphics and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 24 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... each of the one or more *symbol expansion data* is associated with a lower level of hierarchy of one of the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 24. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion data at column 5, lines 41-51. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 25 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... the computer map display is displayed at a first scale and the *symbol expansion display* is displayed *in combination with* the computer map

display at the first scale," as set forth in Claim 25. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion display at column 5, lines 20-27. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion display and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 26 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... each of the one or more *symbol expansion graphics* is associated with a lower level of hierarchy of one of the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 26. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion graphics at column 5, lines 41-51. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion graphics and respectfully request clarification.

Applicants submit that Claim 27 is further patentably distinct over Johnson et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... each of the one or more *symbol expansion data* is associated with a lower level of hierarchy of one of the one or more map display symbols," as set forth in Claim 27. The Examiner asserts that Johnson et al. teaches the claimed symbol expansion data at column 5, lines 41-51. Applicants can find in Johnson et al. no teaching of the claimed symbol expansion data and respectfully request clarification.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be removed.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-27 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance or better form for appeal by restricting the issues on appeal, and thus, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Mar 1, 2004

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: _____

Kermit Robinson
Reg. No. 48,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2354
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, ext. 24
Fax: (781) 401-9966

Attachments: none

Q:\rtn\139pus\rtn-139pus resp to OA of 2003 12 30 rev 1Mar2004.doc